

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/735,141	FITZGIBBON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Au	2612	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Scott Au

(3) Timothy Leustik

(2) Brian Zimmerman

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1/10/08

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: Hsu-Flick-Waraksa

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Mr. Leustik argues Hsu-Flick-Waraksa lacks teaching both transmission of Rolling code & Fingerprint data in the amended cited claims and also the new Claim 14 including separation of the signals.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required